



PLAN FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE (P4P)

Minutes of Work Meeting

December 14, 2010 - 8:00 am at Teton County Courthouse

In attendance: Shawn Hill, Dahvi Wilson, Aaron Driggs, Darryl Johnson, Kendall Jolley

Staff: Angie Rutherford (recorder), Teton County Planner

Also in attendance: Laura Hanson (CRSA), Kevin DeKold (CRSA), Jen Werlin (VARD)

Discussion and Action: Shawn Hill, Chairman of the P4P Committee, opened the meeting and asked the visitors to the meeting to introduce themselves.

Minutes: Mr. Johnson made a motion to approve the Nov. 16 minutes. Mr. Driggs seconded and all were in favor.

Ms. Wilson made a motion to approve the Nov. 30 minutes. Mr. Hill seconded and all were in favor.

Outreach Meetings: Outreach is going well. Ms. Rutherford reported that 633 people (almost 8% if assuming an 8,000 population) have taken the online survey. It was reported that the fire district would like to be involved and we will get them involved in the Comp Plan Committee.

Survey: It was decided to close the survey at 11:59pm on Dec. 23rd. The Committee seemed to think the public input would not vary too much from what it is now, but will double check after the survey is closed to make sure the RFP and committee structure are still consistent with the public input. In the meantime, all proposals will be considered "Draft" documents.

Public Input: The committee proposed five "subcommittee" categories: Natural Resources Management/Recreation, Economic Development/Property Rights, Community Events and Facilities, Rural Character/Cultural Heritage, and Transportation. The Land Use aspect would be discussed in the Core Committee. There was a discussion about Property Rights and where/which committee would address property rights directly. It was determined it should be put with Economic Development as often property rights are an economic issue. The committee would like to see property rights addressed in each subcommittee, but specifically in the Economic Development subcommittee. The subcommittees need to be chosen carefully with a broad group in each subcommittee.

Committee Structure: The committee reviewed Mr. Potter's (not present) comments on the committee structure. The size of each committee/subcommittee was discussed with the caution that it will be difficult to find volunteers to fill all the positions if we make things too big. There should be a diversity of interests established in the subcommittees. Each subcommittee will choose its own chair. The committee discussed stipends for chairs who also serve on the core committee.

It was discussed that the PZC needs to be involved early so that there is buy-in when it gets to their commission. It is recommended that one PZC member be on each subcommittee and one on the core committee. Regardless of an elected's membership on the core committee, there should be frequent check-ins and communication with the BOCC. There was discussion about whether staff should be the core committee chair (with the idea that staff would be neutral and able to provide technical resources). The core committee members should be representing their subcommittees, not necessarily their own personal views. Mr. Hill is uncomfortable putting staff on the core committee. Ms. Wilson commented that it is difficult to find a person that can separate their own beliefs from representation of the public. Ms. Wilson sees the core committee chair as a coordinator and the core committee as a coordinating body. Mr. Hill sees the chair as a hybrid between a facilitator and a committee member making sure all voices are heard, all technical information considered and then voting his/her conscience. This distinction will need to be considered and expectations of committee members and subcommittee members will need to be articulated when the committee members are chosen.

Ms. Wilson mentioned the subcommittee members are more "experts" – not representation only. The public will have a chance to give input via the subcommittees. The core committee will need to incorporate information from the subcommittee as representatives of those committees.

The Committee members are asked to think about these issues and come with ideas for next meeting.

Homework for P4P: Roles of the core committee members, who should be on the subcommittees, and roles of the watchdogs.

RFP: The BOCC has asked the P4P to include implementation as part of the scoring criteria and also timeliness of completion of previous comp plans. Implementation could take the form of familiarity with funding sources.

The P4P worked to weigh the categories of the RFP score card. The public attendees were asked to voluntarily leave for this section so as not to give any consulting firm an unfair advantage, until staff could confirm if the score card would need to be made public. After a strong start, it was determined that Staff would send out a recommendation and the committee would consider the weighting at the next meeting.

Next Meeting: Next meeting was scheduled for 8am on Jan12th.

Mr. Jolley made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Hill seconded and all were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,
Angie Rutherford